



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/472,602	12/27/1999	DAVID J. ALLARD	BC9-99-046-(8982

7590 04/29/2003

MORGAN & FINNEGAN LLP
345 PARK AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10154

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHAU T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------


2142

8

DATE MAILED: 04/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PR4

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/472,602	Applicant(s) Allard et al.	
	Examiner Marc Thompson	Art Unit 2142	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Marc Thompson (USPTO) (3) _____
 (2) Joseph Redmond (Reg. #18,753) (4) _____

Date of Interview Apr 28, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 2, and 4

Identification of prior art discussed:

None specific - general known art, RADIUS standard, network brokering, Request for Comments (RFC) documents

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant inquired about claim modification which would advance prosecution toward allowance. After consultation with Chau Nguyen (PTO examiner changed with application), Examiner suggested elaboration of claimed invention components, including database, routing tables, and router distinctions, clarification of actual DHCP extentions (modifications based on DHCP standards) in order to distinguish extentions from modifications published in related RFCs, the bypassing of server(s) during communications to various ISPs, and revision of description of ISP and/or customer address mappings and routing table updating in combination with any associated DHCP request(s) providing terminal address assignments effecting routing decisions. Applicant advised new search and consideration would be required for proposed amendments, serving to minimize current and future issues in the next Office action.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

MARC THOMPSON · 2142
 Examiner's signature, if required